

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/811,755	03/29/2004	Rahul Khanna	42P18122	2846	
45209 INTEL/BSTZ			EXAMINER		
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			RUBIN, BLAKE J		
	1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
001111111111111111111111111111111111111			2457		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/10/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/811,755	KHANNA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
BLAKE RUBIN	2457	

	BLAKE RUBIN	2457					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 20 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing							
b) Mean The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		26(a) and the appropriat	o outonaion foo				
Laterison of uniter lay be considered under 3 determining the period of set where been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of set under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set of thir (h) above; if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earmed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICIC CF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4, 7-20, 22-24, and 26-30</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	thefere are the date of Classes No.		be sets and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
/ARIO ETIENNE/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/20/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- Applicant is reminded that the basis on which the date of 102(e) document is to be determined is according to the priority of the filling date, NOT the subsequent publication date. Therefor the Goss reference holds a priority of July 28, 2003.
- With respect to amended claims 1 and 7, the claims would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being an obvious combination of Goss, Chen, and Chrabaszcz. The appropriate citations remain unchanged from the previous action.
- 4. With respect to amended claim 15, the claim would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being an obvious combination of Goss and Chrabaszcz. The appropriate citations remain unchanged from the previous action.
- 5. With respect to amended claims 24, the claim would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being an obvious combination of Goss and Chen. The appropriate citations remain unchanged from the previous action.

BJR